

### REMARKS

The applicant has carefully reviewed the application in light of the Office Action dated August 8, 2007. Applicant amends claims 1, 4, 6, and 7. The amendments to the claims have only been done to expedite the prosecution.

### Substance and Summary of Telephonic Interview pursuant to 37 CFR 1.133(b)

Applicant and Examiner participated in a telephone interview on November 8, 2007 at approximately 10:30 a.m. EST, in regards the art cited in the current office action. No agreement was made.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,895,586 issued to Brasher et al., (hereinafter "*Brasher*"). The Examiner rejects Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brasher* as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,731,735 issued to Borgendale (hereinafter "*Borgendale*"). The Examiner also rejects Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brasher* as applied to Claim 4 above, and further in view of Tanenbaum, Andrew S. "Computer Networks." Third Edition, Prentice Hall PTR, 1996; pages 630-643 (hereinafter "*Tanenbaum*"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the comments set forth below.

For example, amended independent claim 1 recites, "wherein the second computer has a message interpreter operable to parse both chains to provide identification of the target component with type and object as well as identification of the parent components with types and objects, wherein the identification includes translating information from the first natural language to a different natural language using both the chains." In particular, the identification of the target component includes translating information from the first natural language to a different natural language using both the chains. Amended independent claims 4, 6, and 7 recite similar limitations. *Brasher* fails to teach or suggest translating between two natural languages,

Applicant : Wolfgang Pfeifer  
Serial No. : 10/811,063  
Filed : March 25, 2004  
Page : 7 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 13913-170US1 / 2001P00030  
WOUS

much less translating between two different languages using both a type chain and an object chain. In addition, the additional references fail to teach or suggest at least the missing limitation. Accordingly, Applicant request reconsideration and allowance of independent claims 1, 4, 6, and 7 and their respective dependents.

Applicant : Wolfgang Pfeifer  
Serial No. : 10/811,063  
Filed : March 25, 2004  
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 13913-170US1 / 2001P00030  
WOUS

### CONCLUSION

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all Claims.

If the present application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained, Applicants hereby request a telephone conference with the Examiner and further request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule the telephone conference.

No fees are believed to be due. However, please apply any deficiencies or any other required fees or any credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing the attorney docket number shown above.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 8, 2007

/Michael E. Cox/  
Michael E. Cox  
Reg. No. 47,505

Customer No.: **32864**  
Fish & Richardson P.C.

Direct Phone: (214) 760-6107  
Fax: (214) 747-2091